



TRANSLATION EVALUATION OF INTERTEXTUAL REFERENCES IN A PLAY OF LITERARY VALUE

Mesut KULELİ* 

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to analyze intertextual references in the original play Coriolanus by Shakespeare and evaluate two Turkish translations of those contexts with intertextual references. Intertextual references are one of the steps of semiological analysis of original texts prior to the act of translation. It is a well-known fact that Shakespeare benefited from Greek and Roman mythologies besides iconographic and historic references, without the analysis of which transferring a Shakespearean work into another culture might lead to losses in signification of the text. As a result of the semiological analysis of the play, 16 contexts were found to feature intertextual references. All those contexts were determined as obligatory intertextuality. Translation evaluation of those contexts showed that while intertextuality was preserved in half of the contexts, designificative tendencies were also determined in the other half, with over-interpretation of the meaning becoming the most frequently used tendency.

Key Words: *Semiotics of translation, intertextuality, obligatory intertextuality, literary translation.*

BİR TİYATRO METNİNDEKİ METİNLERARASI GÖNDERGELERİN EDEBİ DEĞER BAKIMINDAN ÇEVİRİ DEĞERLENDİRMESİ

ÖZET

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Shakespeare'in Coriolanus oyunundaki metinlerarası göndermeleri çözümlmek ve metinlerarası göndermeler saptanan söylemlerin iki Türkçe çevirisini değerlendirmektir. Metindeki metinlerarasılık ilişkileri, çeviri ediminden önce özgün metin çözümlenmesi için uygulanabilecek adımlardan biridir. Shakespeare'in eserlerinde ikonografik ve tarihsel göndermelerin yanı sıra Yunan ve Roma mitolojisinden yararlandığı bilinmektedir. Bu göndermeler yoluyla kurulan metinlerarasılık ilişkilerini çözümlmeden bir Shakespeare metnini başka bir kültüre aktarmak metnin alımlanmasında kayıplara neden olabilmektedir. Oyunun göstergebilimsel çözümlenmesi sonucunda, 16 söylemde metinlerarasılık göndermeler saptanmıştır. Bu söylemlerin tümü, zorunlu metinlerarasılık olarak bulunmuştur. Bu söylemlerin çeviri değerlendirmesine göre söylemlerin yarısında metinlerarasılık

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Bandirma Onyedi Eylul Üniversitesi, Bandirma Meslek Yüksekokulu, mkuleli@bandirma.edu.tr



iliřkileri korunabilmiřken, diđer yarısında anlam bozucu eđilimler saptanmıřtır. En sık kullanılan anlam bozucu eđilimin, anlamın ařırı yorumlanması olduđu saptanmıřtır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Çeviri göstergebilimi, metinlerarasılık, zorunlu metinlerarasılık, yazın çevirisi.*

1.INTRODUCTION

In this part of the study, the theoretical considerations underlying semiotics of translation besides the transition to application are given. Since Saussure (2001^[1916]) suggested that semiotics would be established as a new branch of science, this new scientific study model has attracted the attention of a great many scholars from different fields of study, with translation studies no exception to this mainstream movement. The contribution of semiotics to signification of the source text prior to the act of translation is an undeniable fact in literary translation. With this contribution of semiotics well-grounded, a systematics to compare the source text to the translated product is also required for literary translators and editors. Rather than using semiotics principles only in classical terms drawn upon theoretical considerations, this systematics would also render semiotics as an applied model in literary translation. Öztürk Kasar (2009a) put forward a systematics for semiotics analysis of the source text besides a translation evaluation systematics (Öztürk Kasar, 2009b) which was later revised with the addition of one more item (Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015). In semiotics analysis of the source text, Öztürk Kasar (2009a) suggested analysis of intertextual references as one of the steps prior to the act of translation. Therefore, this study was conducted to show prospective and current literary translators how to analyze the intertextual references in a literary text and how the meaning universe of those contexts with intertextual references were preserved and what designificative tendencies professional literary translators resorted to in rendering a Shakespearean text into Turkish, thereby presenting a guide in literary translation. While the relevant literature abounds in theoretical considerations to literary translation besides translator strategies in literary translation, this study applies a model suggested for analysis of the source text and a systematics to compare the translated product to the source text.

1.1. From Semiotics to Semiotics of Translation: Theoretical Considerations

Semiotics, as an independent branch of science, was first coined and brought to the light by Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. In his book entitled *Cours de Linguistique Générale*, compiled by his students after his death, Saussure (2001^[1916]) coined the term ‘*signe*’ (pp. 105-106) in French and stated that a “new branch of science dealing with those ‘signs’ would emerge soon” (p. 46), and for Saussure (2001) this new branch of science would be an umbrella term "dealing with all signs in social life, rather than a sub-branch of linguistics” (p. 46). Therefore, Saussure (ibid.) can be thought of as the founder of



semiotics besides Charles Sanders Peirce, who coined the term ‘*sign*’ in English almost at the same time that Saussure envisioned the establishment of semiotics; however, it is important to note that there is no evidence to prove whether those two scientists were aware of each other’s studies or not.

Following the footsteps of Saussure, a great many scholars took interest in this new science dealing with signs, namely semiotics. Semiotics also found a wide array of application in translation studies. Öztürk Kasar (2012) states that “semiotics deals with the meaning universe of a text” (p. 432), which is also one of the problematics of translation studies, therefore these two sciences, while contributing to other branches of science as well as welcoming contributions from other branches, can complement one another, as well. A great many scholars have dealt with the interaction between semiotics and translation studies. One of the earliest studies proposing this interaction can be attributed to Ludskanov (1975), who maintained that the act of translation is nothing more than conveying the signs of a language with the signs of another language, thus paving the way for translators to benefit from semiotics and semiological analysis.

Another early study to focus on the interaction between semiotics and translation studies was by Dinda L. Gorfée (1994) who suggested that “the act of translation involves coming up with solutions to the problems encountered during translation” (p. 67) and that the act of translation indeed involves a ‘semiological decision making process’ (p. 75). Inspired by Peirce and Wittgenstein, Gorfée (2012) stated that “semiotics and translation studies involve an exchange between the old and new signs in and between languages” (p. 31).

Torop (2000) maintains that “semiotics of translation is historically concerned with both semiotics and translation studies” (p. 597), and this implies that the translator’s work is no different from that of semiotics concerns, but rather they use almost the same steps. Stecconi (2007) also touches on the relationship between semiotics and translation studies, rendering the latter one as the beneficiary of this relationship. Like Torop and Stecconi, Nowotna (2005) is another eminent scholar dealing with this interaction. Studying on the ‘subjectivity’ issue in literary texts, Nowotna (ibid.) clarifies the contribution of semiological analysis to translation of the literary texts.

Another scholar dealing with this mutual interaction in literature is Öztürk Kasar (2001) who considered the act of translation as an interaction between the author and the translator. Öztürk Kasar (2009a) coined the term ‘*sémiotique de la traduction*’ (semiotics of translation) in French and stated that semiotics of translation could help “readers and translators in discourse level; editors and again translators in inter discourse level; translation scholars and researchers in meta discourse level” (pp. 165-166). With this proposition, the exact interaction between semiotics and translation studies seems to have been established. For Öztürk Kasar (ibid.), reaching the meaning universe of a literary text and

reproducing the meaning is the main concern of semiotics, and Öztürk Kasar (2016a) adds that “literary texts are woven with traps in meaning” (p. 43), suggesting the inevitable use of semiotics and semiological analysis as guide to translating literary texts. Moreover, Öztürk Kasar (2016b) suggests that “semiotics provides the ground for translation besides enabling the translator or editors to compare and evaluate the translated text” (p. 258). Drawing on Paris School of Semiotics, Öztürk Kasar (2009a) proposed a model for semiological analysis of a source text for translation. In this model, Öztürk Kasar (ibid.) proposed various steps for semiological analysis of the source text that will help the literary translator to come up with solutions to meaning traps in the text. While these steps may serve as a useful guide to the translator prior to the process of translation, Öztürk Kasar (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) also suggests a systematic for the evaluation of translated product. ‘Systematics of Designificative Tendencies in Translation’ was first proposed as an eight-item systematics by Öztürk Kasar (2009b); however, it was expanded with the integration of a ninth item in 2015. Therefore, any literary translator can benefit from Öztürk Kasar’s (2009a) model for semiological analysis of the source text for translation of the literary text besides Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) Systematics of Designificative Tendencies in Translation to compare and evaluate the translated product as the model and systematics are specific enough to use in literary translation. Rather than stating the general premises of literary translation, the model suggested by Öztürk Kasar (2009a) presents steps with the reasons underlying the importance of these particular steps. Moreover, the systematics for translation evaluation has been used by Tuna and Kuleli (2017) in different genres of literature such as a short story, a play, a novel and a poem, and it was found that this systematics lends itself to translation evaluation in any of these genres. It is important to note that scholars dealing with translation studies and editors can also benefit from the Systematics of Designificative Tendencies in Translation to compare the meaning universe and signs of the source text to the translated text.

Therefore, semiotics of translation provides a guide to literary translators on what to focus on in rendering the signs in the target text. It also helps the literary translators solve out the signs used in the source text and thereby reach the meaning universe of the text.

1.2. From Theory to Practice: Analysis of Intertextuality in *Coriolanus* by Shakespeare through the Lenses of Semiotics of Translation

In this study, Shakespeare’s play *Coriolanus*, supposed to have been written in 1607-1608 (Sevgen, 2017: p. XXIX), and republished by Oxford University Press in 1998 was analyzed from semiotics of translation point of view. In the semiological analysis of the source text, only one of the steps, namely intertextuality, suggested by Öztürk Kasar (2009a) as a model for semiological analysis was employed in order to evaluate the texts. Intertextuality is a frequent phenomenon in almost all



Shakespeare works. Even while narrating a simple daily event, Shakespeare is known to make use of iconographic or mythological references, rendering readers to turn to their background knowledge or make extensive readings to reach the meaning universe of the context. In translation analysis, two Turkish translations of the play, one in 1945, and the other one in 1994, were chosen. The reason for this choice is that it was only after 2001, with Berke Vardar translating Saussure's work *Cours de Linguistique Générale*, that semiotics began to be discussed and adopted more extensively in Turkey. Upto that date, even if literary translators had means to solving out the signs in source texts, it was far from a systematicity contrary to the case today. While this does not underestimate the value of their translated products, how they achieved mastery in translation of a Shakespearean play deserves to be investigated. Moreover, the designificative tendencies used in these translations also deserve to be explained in detail for young literary translators to see how the transfer of a Shakespearean text was achieved into Turkish culture. Using a designificative tendency is not something to be avoided all the time, but rather it might be the only choice in transfer between cultures at times. It is beyond doubt that these two Turkish translations of the play *Coriolanus* are noteworthy as these two translators had also translated other texts by Shakespeare, rendering them a command in analyzing intertextual references in Shakespeare's works. Therefore, the selection criteria for Turkish translations of the play are that it is supposed to have been published before 2001 and the translator is supposed to have translated other Shakespearean texts. In this study, 1945 translation was labelled as TT1 (Target Text 1) and 1994 translation was labelled as TT2 (Target Text 2). They were analyzed and evaluated from semiotics of translation point of view. While there are some other translations of the play by different translators in Turkish, these two translations were particularly chosen because these translators already translated other works of Shakespeare, as well, and they are considered prominent translators in Turkish. The reason for choosing these eminent translators' translations of the play *Coriolanus* is to show how potential translators of Shakespearean works can refrain from designificative tendencies in translating intertextual references or can explain the designificative tendencies that they resorted to by referring to these translators.

In translation evaluation of the play, Öztürk Kasar's (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) Systematics of Designificative Tendencies in Translation was used. Even though this is a collaborative research, this systematics is only referred to Öztürk Kasar because the preliminary systematics was suggested by Öztürk Kasar (2009b) and the final version, with the addition of a ninth item, was also designed by Öztürk Kasar. In this systematic, there are nine items, each corresponding to a different level of designificative tendency. These tendencies in Öztürk Kasar's (ibid.) systematic are: [1] 'over-interpretation of the meaning', in which the translator renders a covert sign overtly into the target language; [2] 'darkening of the meaning', in which the translator provides a covert meaning for the sign



that was overtly used in the source text; [3] ‘under-interpretation of the meaning’, in which the translator provides a missing meaning for the sign that has a broader meaning in the source text; [4] ‘sliding of the meaning’, in which the translator provides a meaning for the sign that is potential but not applicable in the source text; [5] ‘alteration of the meaning’, in which the translator provides a different meaning for the sign that does not have this meaning; [6] ‘opposition of the meaning’, in which the translator provides a meaning in the target language that is just the opposite of the meaning in the source text; [7] ‘perversion of the meaning’, in which the translator produces a meaning that is entirely irrelevant to the source text; [8] ‘destruction of the meaning’, in which the translator produces a context that carries some traces from the source text but meaningless in the target language; [9] ‘wiping out of the meaning’, in which the translator does not translate signs or contexts available in the source text into the target language (Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015: p. 463). In this analysis, all findings regarding intertextuality are given; however, while there are designificative tendencies in the translations of some contexts, there are no designificative tendencies in other contexts. Therefore, some examples regarding intertextuality below are given with their Turkish translations if translation evaluation yielded designificative tendencies, but other examples are only given as semiological analysis findings from the source text as there was no designificative tendency in either translation of the contexts in Turkish.

2. ANALYSIS OF INTERTEXTUALITY IN THE PLAY *CORIOLANUS* AND TRANSLATIONS OF CONTEXTS WITH INTERTEXTUALITY

Intertextuality, as its very name implies, is the creation of a text based on already existing texts. According to Öztürk Kasar (2009a), an author may refer to other texts in the construction of a new text, and the analysis of these references might be of crucial importance for the meaning universe of a literary text. In this study, intertextuality analysis of the source text was conducted based on Michael Riffaterre’s intertextuality theory. According to Riffaterre (1990), a text can only bear an intertextual nature if the reader can recognize and find intertextuality, therefore Riffaterre adopts a reader-oriented approach to intertextuality. For Riffaterre (ibid.), an author creates a literary text in a network of intertextual relationships and deliberately leaves some blanks for readers to fill by referring to their literary, social or historical background. Riffaterre (1978) coined the term ‘ungrammaticality’ and defined this term as a distortion in the meaning universe of a context, which the readers have to work out by referring to their background, in other terms, by making intertextual reading. Riffaterre (ibid.) also used the term ‘retroactive reading’ for the act of intertextual reading. According to Riffaterre (ibid.), once readers feel and recognize the ungrammaticality in a context, they make a retroactive reading to solve out the ungrammaticality, thereby solving the intertextual reference and grasping the meaning universe of a context. Aktulum (2011), in defining and clarifying the concepts of intertextuality, also refers to



Riffaterre's concepts of ordinary intertextuality and obligatory intertextuality. According to Aktulum (ibid.), these two terms can be attributed to Riffaterre. While Aktulum (ibid.) defines ordinary intertextuality as "covert intertextual references that cannot be recognized easily in a text" (p. 466), obligatory intertextuality is defined as "overt ungrammaticalities that compel a reader to solve out throughout the text and almost impossible to miss in a text" (p. 487). While Shakespeare uses both of them, obligatory intertextuality, that is, direct references to other texts or historical facts, can more commonly be found in his works.

In this study, based on Riffaterre's (1978; 1990) intertextuality concepts and theory, obligatory intertextual references were found drawing on ungrammaticalities in Shakespeare's play *Coriolanus*, and these references were solved out by making retro-active reading. Afterwards, the importance of solving out those ungrammaticalities for reaching the meaning universe was reported. Below are the contexts with intertextual references from the play:

Example 1:

"MENENIUS

I shall tell you

A pretty tale."

(Shakespeare, 1998: p. 163)

...

"There was a time when all the body's members,

Rebelled against the belly, thus accused it:

That only like a gulf it did remain

I' th' midst o' th' body, idle and unactive,

Still cupboarding the viand, never bearing

Like labour with the rest; where the other instruments

Did see and hear, devise, instruct, walk, feel,

And, mutually participate, did minister

Unto the appetite and affection common

Of the whole body. The belly answered"

(ibid., p. 164)

...

"True is it, my incorporate friends,' quoth he,

That I receive the general food at first

Which you do live upon, and fit it is,

Because I am the storehouse and the shop

Of the whole body. But, if you do remember,

I send it through the rivers of your blood

Even to the court, the heart, to th' seat o' the brain;



And through the cranks and offices of man
The strongest nerves and small inferior veins
From me receive that natural competency
Whereby they live.”
(ibid., pp. 166-167)

...

“Though all at once cannot
See what I do deliver out to each,
Yet I can make my audit up that all
From me do back receive the flour of all
And leave me but the bran.”
(ibid., p. 167)

In this context, one of the characters in the play, Menenius tells the public a tale as can be understood from the sentence “I shall tell you / A pretty tale” (Shakespeare, 1998: 163). When the public revolts against the Senate in Rome claiming that the Senate members store the whole grain for themselves and sell it to the public at high prices, Menenius tries to calm them by telling a tale about the revolt of other body organs against the belly. The sentence “There was a time when all the body’s members / Rebelled against the belly” (ibid., p. 164) warns the reader against an ungrammaticality because it does not fit in with the context of the play, therefore the reader must solve this ungrammaticality by engaging in retroactive reading. As a result of retroactive reading, it was found that this tale was taken from one of Aesop’s fables. Hale (1968) states that Aesop’s fable *The Fable of the Belly* was a common analogy used in the Middle Ages in political arena. Therefore, the author of the play seems to have benefitted from Aesop’s fable to make the narration more attractive and make the reader turn to retroactive reading to solve out the ungrammaticality. A reader can easily recognize this intertextuality because it was overtly integrated into the play with the sign ‘a pretty tale’, which is why this intertextual relationship can be categorized as obligatory intertextuality. No designificative tendency was found in translations of this context in either target text.

Example 2:

“MARTIUS
They said they were an-hungry, sighed forth proverbs-
That hunger broke stone walls,”
(Shakespeare, 1998: 171)

In the context above, the sign ‘proverbs’ warns the reader that the author will use a proverb from English culture, which can also be regarded as an intertextual reference. Because the author overtly shows this reference, this can be categorized as obligatory intertextuality. While one of the characters from the play, Martius is trying to tell the fury of the public against the Senate for storing grain, that



character utters one of the proverbs the public used to make their hunger clear to the Senate members. The author embellishes the narration with this intertextual reference. With retroactive reading, it is easy to find that in English, there is a proverb “Hunger breaks through stone walls” (Apperson and Manser, 2007: 295) and the first use of this proverb in English literature was attributed to the year 1546. The proverb “Hunger broke stone walls” (Shakespeare, 1998: 171) was used in past simple tense in the source text context in order to warn the reader of ungrammaticality since the tense used in proverbs is generally present simple tense. As a result of the analysis of the target texts, no designificative tendency was found in the translation of this context in either target text.

Example 3:

“VIRGILIA

His bloody brow? O Jupiter, no blood!”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 180)

When Virgilia, Martius Coriolanus’ wife, expects news from the war her husband is involved against Aufidius’ army, she begs God to protect her husband. For this simple context, the author constructs a mythological reference using the sign ‘Jupiter’. The reader recognizes the ungrammaticality easily because the reference was overtly given, which makes it an obligatory intertextuality. With retroactive reading in order to solve out this ungrammaticality, it was found that Jupiter was the most important god for Romans and was associated with military power and victory (Roman and Roman, 2010: 523). It should come as no surprise that the author of the play used Jupiter for Virgilia’s begging for survival as her husband is in a war, therefore Jupiter is the ideal choice of God in these lines. As a result of the analysis of the target texts, no designificative tendency was found in the translation of this context in either target text as both translators preserved the intertextual sign ‘Jupiter’ in their translations.

Example 4:

“VOLUMNIA

The breasts of Hecuba

When she did suckle Hector looked not lovelier

Than Hector's forehead when it spit forth blood

At Grecian sword, contemning.”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 180-181)

The signs ‘Hecuba’ and ‘Hector’ create ungrammaticality in the lines above. Because the signs are explicitly integrated into the context by the author, they can be regarded as obligatory intertextuality. As a result of retroactive reading to solve out the ungrammaticality, it was found that Hecuba was the daughter of Cisseus in mythology and she was the mother of Hector (Roman and Roman, 2010: 188).

Volumnia is Martius Coriolanus' mother, therefore this intertextual reference to mythology sounds plausible in that Hecuba was Hector's mother, as is the case for Volumnia and Coriolanus. The sentence "Hector's forehead when it spit forth blood" (Shakespeare, 1998: 180-181) also refers to a mythological event, which can be solved out with retroactive reading. In Troy War, Hector insists on fighting Achilles, who kills him with a sword (Thompson, 2004: 107). In target texts, there was no designificative tendency in the translation of these intertextual references.

Example 5:

“VALERIA

Come, lay aside your stitchery. I must have you play
the idle husewife with me this afternoon.

VIRGILIA

No, good madam, I will not out of doors.

VALERIA

You would be another Penelope. Yet they say all
the yarn she spun in Ulysses' absence did but fill
Ithaca full of moths.”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 182-183)

Explicit intertextual references to mythology are present here, which can be grasped through retroactive reading. Because intertextual signs are explicitly given by the author, this reference can be considered an obligatory intertextuality relationship. It was found that in Homer's *Odyssey*, Penelope weaves and unweaves shroud for Leartes in order to refrain from her suitors while waiting for her husband's (Odysseus) return (Murnaghan, 2009: 230-231). The context above recounts this mythological event and paves the way for a mythological reference. Virgilia does not want to go out for fun when her husband is in a war, therefore the author, through another character called Valeria draws an analogy to this mythological event in order to describe the situation Virgilia is in. However, it is important to note that the author used Ulysses rather than Odysseus as distinct from the original mythological reference. With more retroactive reading, it was found that Grant (2011) stated that the names Ulysses and Odysseus were used to refer to the same person. Turkish translations of the intertextual reference 'Ulysses' are given below:

TT1

“Siz ikinci bir Penelope olmağa özeniyorsunuz; fakat derler ki, Ülis'in yokluğunda, Penelope'in iyirdiği yün Ithaca'yı güvelerle doldurmuş.”

(Shakespeare, 1945: 20)

TT2

“İkinci bir Penelope olmak istiyorsun; ama dediklerine göre, Odiseus'un yokluğunda o kadar fazla yün eğirmiş ki, İtaka güve dolmuş.”

(Shakespeare, 1994: 36)

In the translated context above, while ‘Ulysses’ was translated into Turkish as ‘Ülis’ and the intertextual sign was preserved in TT1, this sign was translated as ‘Odiseus’ in TT2, directly referring to Odysseus, the other name for Ulysses. Therefore, TT2, this intertextual reference was over interpreted by the translator, which was coined as over interpretation of the meaning tendency by Öztürk Kasar (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015). While the readers of the source text have to make retroactive reading to find out why the sign ‘Ulysses’ was used in a mythological event referring to Penelope and Odysseus, the readers of TT2 do not have to make this retroactive reading and are already equipped with a clear meaning of the hidden sign.

Example 6:

“MARTIUS

Now Mars, I prithee, make us quick in work,”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 185)

Martius Coriolanus is in a war against Aufidius’ army and begs God to finish the war in a quick manner as in the sentence “Mars, I prithee, make us quick in work” (ibid., p. 185). It is important to note that the mythological God ‘Mars’ was used explicitly in the context above, rendering the reference as an obligatory intertextuality, and it is the sign ‘Mars’ that creates the ungrammaticality, and therefore triggers the reader to make a retroactive reading. As a result of the retroactive reading, it was found that Ares was another name for Mars in mythology and Mars was worshipped as God of war (Hamilton, 2017). In the extract from the text above, because Martius Coriolanus is in a war, it is hardly surprising that the author refers to the God of war, Mars, in the character’s begging for quick finish. No designificative tendency was found in Turkish translations of the context, and the sign ‘Mars’ was preserved in both translations.

Example 7:

“MARTIUS

Pluto and hell:

All hurt behind! Backs red, and faces pale

With flight and agued fear!”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 187)

As some troops from Martius Coriolanus’ army withdrew from the war, this drove Martius crazy. In order to show this anger, the author has the character use an intertextual reference, which is explicitly stated and so categorized as obligatory intertextuality. It is the sign ‘Pluto’ that creates the ungrammaticality in this example because the reader may not expect a planet’s or mythological God’s name in a context showing fury. With retroactive reading, it was found that Pluto was a mythological God that governed the underworld (Ring, 2003). Moreover, Pluto is generally associated with Hades

(Tanha, 2014: 46). In the context above, the signs ‘Pluto’ and ‘hell’ were used in approximation, which makes the reader think that the author referred to the mythological God of the underworld, and therefore ‘hell’, to make the narration more appealing. Seeing some of his troops withdraw from the war, Martius Coriolanus wants those troops to go to hell, showing anger, where they will be welcomed by Pluto. In both translations of the context, this intertextual reference was preserved, and the sign ‘Pluto’ was translated as ‘Pluto’ in both target texts.

Example 8:

“AUFIDIUS

Wert thou the Hector

That was the whip of your bragged progeny,

Thou shouldst not ‘scape me here.”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 198)

Aufidius is about to get into a one to one fight with his rival and enemy, Martius Coriolanus and tries to show his bravery with the sentence “Thou shouldst not ‘scape me” (ibid.). However, the sign ‘Hector’ creates an ungrammaticality, therefore a retroactive reading is essential to grasp the meaning universe of this context. It was found that “Hector was the greatest of the Trojan heroes in Homer’s *Iliad*” (Leeming, 2005: 174). Therefore, the author might have had the character show his bravery with an intertextual reference. The aim of this reference is to show how brave Aufidius is, even as brave as to defeat the greatest hero of Troy. It is only after a retroactive reading that the reader can understand the bravery of Aufidius. Because the mythological God ‘Hector’ was explicitly stated in the context, this can be thought as an obligatory intertextuality. In both translations of the context, the sign ‘Hector’, and thereby intertextuality, was preserved without any designificative tendency.

Example 9:

“MENENIUS

Meeting two such wealsmen as you are,

I cannot call you Lycurguses. If the drink you give me

touch my palate adversely, I make a crooked face at it.”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 208-209)

The character Menenius is addressing two other characters, Brutus and Sicinius, conspirators against Martius Coriolanus in the play. When Brutus and Sicinius address Martius Coriolanus as an arrogant person, Menenius opposes to them by revealing their bad traits. However, the sign ‘Lycurgus’ leads to ungrammaticality, causing the reader to make retroactive reading to solve out this explicitly stated intertextual reference, thereby an obligatory intertextuality, in order to grasp the meaning universe of the context. It was found that Lycurgus was a ‘Spartan lawgiver’ (Nagy, 1992: 274). With this

intertextual reference, the author has the character blame Brutus and Sicinius for their unlawful and immoral activities with the sentence “I cannot call you Lycurguses” (Shakespeare, 1998: 208). In Turkish translations of the intertextual sign ‘Lycurgus’, the sign was preserved as an intertextual reference in Turkish, too. Therefore, no designificative tendency was found in translations of this context.

Example 10:

“MENENIUS

Yet you must be saying, Martius is proud,
Who, in a cheap estimation, is worth predecessors
since Deucalion, though peradventure some of the
best of 'em were hereditary hangmen.”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 210)

Menenius tries to praise Martius Coriolanus against the bad words of Brutus and Sicinius. However, the sign ‘Deucalion’ creates an ungrammaticality here. Because it was used together with the time expression ‘since’, it is clear that this sign refers to a time interval or an important event in the past. In order to solve out this ungrammaticality, retroactive reading was conducted, which yielded the finding that Deucalion is an “extra-Biblical flood story” (Kraeling, 1947: 177), and Deucalion was a flood in ancient Greek mythology caused by Zeus’ anger in third millennium B.C. (Graves, 2017). From these findings, it is clear that the sign ‘Deucalion’ was used to show that Menenius thinks of Martius Coriolanus as the greatest leader of the last 3000 years. This simple fact was embellished with an obligatory intertextual reference in the play by the author. It is categorized as an obligatory intertextuality because the intertextual reference was clearly given by the author. Below are Turkish translations of this sign:

TT1

“Marcius en ařađı bir takdirle tufandan beri...”

(Shakespeare, 1945: 42)

TT2

“...en ařađı Deucalion’dan bu yana...”

(Shakespeare, 1994: 60)

While the intertextual reference in the source text was preserved in TT2 using the intertextual sign, the sign ‘Deucalion’ was translated as the sign ‘tufan’ (flood) in TT1. While the sign ‘Deucalion’ refers to a specific flood from Greek mythology, ‘tufan’ (flood) in TT1 is a general sign used to refer to any flood. According to Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematics, the designificative tendency in TT1 can be categorized as darkening of the meaning, in which the translator produces a covert or more general sign for a specific and overt sign in the source text.

Example 11:

“MENENIUS

A letter for me? It gives me an estate of seven
years' health, in which time I will make a lip at
the physician. The most sovereign prescription in
Galen is but empiricuteic and, to this preservative,
of no better report than a horse-drench.”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 211-212)

Menenius receives a letter from Martius Coriolanus, who returns from the war against Aufidius' army with victory. Glad to receive a letter from Martius Coriolanus, the character Menenius tries to show his happiness, stating that this letter was like a therapy for him. However, the sign ‘Galen’ leads to an ungrammaticality. Because it is spelt with a capital initial, it is clear that it is a proper noun. However, a retroactive reading is necessary in order to solve out the ungrammaticality to reach the meaning universe. According to French (2002), Galen was a doctor to various emperors and gladiators in ancient times. The author has the character build an intertextual relationship to define happiness, which can be considered an obligatory intertextuality because the sign leading to intertextuality was explicitly provided by the author in the context. The sentence “The most sovereign prescription in Galen is but empiricuteic ... no better report than a horse-drench” (Shakespeare, 1998: 211-212) is an emphatic way of showing how happy the character felt receiving a letter from Martius Coriolanus, comparing it to the greatest doctor's therapy in those times. Therefore, this intertextual reference should be translated in such a way that this context should also make the target text reader refer to previous reading to solve out the intertextuality. Below are Turkish translations of this context:

TT1

“Bana bir mektup...Kalinos'un en kuvvetli reęetesi bile, bunun yanında bir kocakarı ilacı, bir baytar reęetesi gibi kalır.”

(Shakespeare, 1945: 43)

TT2

“Bana mektup var!...Bunun yanında Galen'in en etkili ilacı üfürükçü işi kalır...”

(Shakespeare, 1994: 60)

In the translations above, the overt intertextual sign ‘Galen’ was translated as ‘Kalinus’ in TT1, yet this sign was preserved in TT2 with the sign ‘Galen’. According to Bölükbaşı (2018), Galen affected both Eastern and Western medicine with his medical applications from the 2nd century to the 18th century, and he is known as ‘Calinos’ in Eastern medicine. Therefore, while the western world (English-speaking countries) referred to this doctor as Galen, the eastern countries referred to this doctor as Calinos. The designificative tendency in TT1 can be categorized as sliding of meaning according to Öztürk Kasar's (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematics since ‘Kalinus’ is one of the potential signs to refer to

Galen, but this was not the case in the source text, the sign ‘Kalinós’ can preserve intertextuality in the context, though.

Example 12:

“BRUTUS
Our veiled dames
Commit the war of white and damask in
Their nicely guarded cheeks to th’ wanton spoil
Of Phoebus' burning kisses.”
(Shakespeare, 1998: 218)

The sign “Phoebus’ burning kisses” leads to ungrammaticality because there is no character with this name in the play to give kisses. Therefore, the reader feels the need to make retroactive reading to solve out the ungrammaticality. According to Bulfinch (2017), Phoebus was the God of sun in mythology. In line with this retroactive reading, the author can be thought to have used the mythological reference ‘Phoebus’ to refer to sun. Because the intertextual sign was explicitly used by the author, this can be regarded as an obligatory intertextuality. Below are Turkish translations of this context:

TT1
“...hanımlarımız bile, pembe beyaz yüzlerini kızgın güneş açmaktan çekinmiyorlar.”
(Shakespeare, 1945: 48)

TT2
“...bayanlarımız,/ Kibarca boyanmış yüzlerinin beyazıyla pembesini / Phoebus’un yakıcı öpücükleriyle...”
(Shakespeare, 1994: 60)

While the sign ‘Phoebus’, was preserved in TT2, it was translated as the sign ‘güneş’ (sun) in TT1. It is clear that the author referred to sun with the sign ‘Phoebus’ in the source text but achieved this through intertextual reference to mythology. In TT1, the intertextual reference in the source text was eliminated by rendering a covert sign in the source text with an overt sign in the target language, which can be categorized as over interpretation of the meaning according to Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematics of designificative tendencies in translation.

Example 13:

“MESSENGER
The nobles bended
As to Jove's statue, and the commons made
A shower and thunder with their caps and shouts.
I never saw the like.”
(Shakespeare, 1998: 221)

In the sentence “The nobles bended / As to Jove’s statue” (ibid.), the sign ‘Jove’ creates ungrammaticality, making it necessary for the reader to turn to retroactive reading. Because the reference is explicitly provided by the author, it can be categorized as obligatory intertextuality. As a result of the retroactive reading, it was found that Jove is another name for the Greek mythological God Zeus, and therefore another name for mythological God Jupiter (Hansen and Hansen, 2005: 237). Now that ‘Jove’ is a mythological God, it should come as no surprise that nobles bend to his statue. Below are the Turkish translations of this intertextual reference:

TT1

“Asiller onun önünde, Jüpiter heykeli önünde imiş gibi eğildiler.”

(Shakespeare, 1945: 49-50)

TT2

“Soylular, Jüpiter heykelinin önünde eğilir gibi eğiliyor,”

(Shakespeare, 1994: 69)

In both translations, the intertextual sign was translated as ‘Jüpiter’. As a result of the retroactive reading it had been found that Jove was another name for Jüpiter, therefore, the author might have deliberately used this sign for the reader to make retroactive reading. However, in both translations, it was translated with the contribution of the translators. According to Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematics of designificative tendencies, this can be categorized as over interpretation of meaning because the readers of both target texts can grasp the meaning universe without much retroactive reading unlike the readers of the source text.

Example 14:

“COMINIUS

At sixteen years,

When Tarquin made a head for Rome, he fought

Beyond the mark of others. Our then dictator,

Whom with all praise I point at, saw him fight

When with his Amazonian chin he drove

The bristled lips before him.”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 226-227)

One of the characters of the play, Cominius praises Martius Coriolanus for his bravery. Though Tarquin is a frequent sign in Shakespearean plays, therefore possibly familiar to the reader, the sign ‘Amazonian chin’ creates ungrammaticality. As a result of retroactive reading, it was found that “Amazonian chin refers to a beardless chin, like that of a woman warrior” (Stewart, 1998: 32). Therefore, it is clear that the author is referring to beardless times, which means very young ages of

Martius Coriolanus with this intertextual reference. Because the sign is explicitly provided by the author, it can be categorized as obligatory intertextuality. Below are the Turkish translations of the context:

TT1

“Hepimizin şitayişle bahsettiği o zamanki diktatörümüz de karşısında bir kadın gibi bıyıksız sakalsız bir gencin saçlı sakallıları sürdürdüğünü gördü”.

(Shakespeare, 1945: 54)

TT2

“O zamanki imparatorumuz, / Ki her türlü övgüye layıktır, / O Amazon yüzlü gencin, / Onca sakalı bitmişle nasıl çarpıştığını, / Onları nasıl önüne katıp sürdürdüğünü görmüştü.”

(Shakespeare, 1994: 74)

The intertextual reference ‘Amazonian’ was preserved in TT2; however, this sign was clearly rendered for the translated text reader TT1. While the reader of TT2 still has to make retroactive reading to find the intertextual reference in this context, the reader of TT1 will readily grasp the meaning the author covertly produces in the source text. This can be categorized as over interpretation of meaning according to Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematics because the translator over interpreted the meaning of a covert sign.

Example 15:

“SICINIUS

It is a mind

That shall remain a poison where it is,

Not poison any further.

CORIOLANUS

‘Shall remain’?

Hear you this Triton of the minnows? Mark you

His absolute ‘shall’?”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 250)

Martius Coriolanus talks about the bad deeds of Sicinius and Brutus. However, the sign ‘Triton’ creates ungrammaticality because it is not one of the characters in the play, nor has it ever been used by the author thus far in this play. Therefore, a retroactive reading is necessary to solve out this ungrammaticality. Triton was the God of sea and trumpeter of Neptune in classical mythology (Bulfinch, 2017). In this context, Coriolanus refers to Sicinius as ‘Triton’ to show him as the trumpeter of Brutus. Because the sign was explicitly given by the author, this is an obligatory intertextuality. Without making a retroactive reading, it is hardly possible for the reader to grasp the fact that Coriolanus considers Sicinius only as the spokesman for Brutus’ bad deeds. Below are Turkish translations of the context:

TT1

“...Şu küçük balıklar ilahını işitiyor musunuz...?”

(Shakespeare, 1945: 73)

TT2

“...Hele hele şu minik balıkların Triton’una bakın!...”

(Shakespeare, 1994: 97)

As can be seen in the translations above, while the intertextual reference was translated as ‘Triton’ in TT2 and the intertextual nature of this sign was preserved, this sign was translated as ‘ilah’ (God) in TT1, eliminating the intertextual reference for the reader and giving a covert sign as an overt meaning in the translated text. This can be considered over interpretation of the meaning according to Öztürk Kasar’s (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematics.

Example 16:

“CORIOLANUS

‘Shall’?

O good but most unwise patricians, why,

You grave but reckless senators, have you thus

Given Hydra here to choose an officer

That, with his peremptory ‘shall’, being but

The horn and noise o’ th’ monster’s.”

(Shakespeare, 1998: 251)

Martius Coriolanus criticizes the people of Rome and the Senate members for choosing Sicinius and Brutus as officers. However, the sign ‘Hydra’ creates ungrammaticality because there is no such a character in the play to choose Brutus and Sicinius as officers. Therefore, this obligatory intertextuality can be understood only through retroactive reading. “Hydra is the multiheaded monster in Greek mythology” (Penning, 2002: 4). With this finding, the ungrammaticality in the context is solved out and it becomes obvious that the author refers to the public in Rome through the sign ‘Hydra’ by using its multiheaded feature. Below are Turkish translations of this context:

TT1

“... niçin yedi başlı ejderhaya bir vekil seçme hakkını verdiniz;...”

(Shakespeare, 1945: 73)

TT2

“...Nasıl oldu da, bu Hydra’nın / Böyle bir temsilci seçmesine izin verdiniz?”

(Shakespeare, 1994: 97)

While the inerrtextual reference ‘Hydra’ in the source text was translated as ‘Hydra’ in TT2, preserving the sign and intertextual reference, this sign was translated as ‘yedi başlı ejderha’ (seven-headed dragon) in TT1, eliminating the intertextual reference sign with an over interpretation. Because

the covert sign in the source text was overtly translated into Turkish in TT1, this can be regarded as over interpretation of meaning according to Öztürk Kasar's (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) systematics.

3. CONCLUSION

In this study, the play *Coriolanus* by Shakespeare was analyzed from semiotics of translation point of view. According to Öztürk Kasar's (2009a) model for a semiological analysis of a literary text, analyzing the intertextuality might be of great help for translators prior to the act of translation. As a result of intertextuality analysis based on Riffaterre's (1978; 1990) intertextuality theory and concepts, 16 contexts were found to include intertextual references to mythology or iconography. It is important to note that all references were categorized as obligatory intertextuality because the author provided the intertextual references explicitly, easy to recognize with the ungrammaticality the signs produced for any reader. It can be stated that without retroactive reading as suggested by Riffaterre (1978), the meaning universe of the contexts with intertextuality, therefore the meaning universe of the whole text, cannot be grasped either by the reader or by the translator.

The contexts with intertextual references were also analyzed for their translations in Turkish. To this end, two Turkish translations of the novel were compared to the source text based on Öztürk Kasar's (in Öztürk Kasar and Tuna, 2015) Systematics of Designificative Tendencies in Translation. Translation evaluation of the contexts with intertextual references showed that of the 16 contexts, eight (50%) of them were translated into Turkish without any designificative tendency by either translator. However, eight (50%) contexts were translated into Turkish with designificative tendencies, seven of them in only one translation, one in both translations analyzed in this study. Of the eight contexts with designificative tendencies in translations, six (75%) of them turned out to be with over interpretation of meaning, one (12.5%) with darkening of meaning, and one (12.5%) with sliding of meaning. Therefore, while translators were able to translate the contexts with intertextual references into Turkish in half of the cases, over interpretation of the meaning, darkening of the meaning and sliding of the meaning tendencies were used in half of the contexts. Prospective literary translators can conclude from these findings that it may be inevitable or mandatory to resort to designificative tendencies in translating intertextual references either due to the very nature of the source and target languages or due to translators' personal choices or purposes in translation.

It is important to note that translation evaluation was conducted only on contexts with intertextual references in this study because the source text was analyzed in terms of intertextuality, one of the steps of semiological analysis as suggested by Öztürk Kasar (2009a). Tuna and Kuleli (2017: 265) suggest that while it is possible to conduct a translation evaluation on the whole text, it is also possible to conduct translation evaluation only on the steps followed in the semiological analysis of a literary text. Kuleli



and Ural (2015) also analyzed intertextual references in another play by Shakespeare and came up with the finding that Shakespeare frequently used intertextual references, and translation evaluation was conducted only on contexts with intertextual references, concluding that translators used over interpretation of the meaning tendency in translating certain contexts with intertextual references. At this point, the importance of semiotics of translation can be understood clearly, as a guide to the translators before beginning with the translation act. Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017a) analyzed Shakespeare's Sonnet 130 from semiotics of translation point of view and concluded that translators used designificative tendencies in translation either consciously or unconsciously, but they still used them to convey the meaning in the target language. In another study, Öztürk Kasar and Tuna (2017b) suggested that the meanings of signs tend to be hidden in a literary text, and it falls to the reader and the translator to bring those hidden meanings into the limelight, and they propose semiotics of translation as a model to help readers and translators in grasping the meaning universe of a literary text. According to Tuna (2016: 96) "semiotics of translation helps in translation of a literary text as much as it does in grasping the meaning universe". Öztürk Kasar and Batu (2017), analyzing a short story by Oscar Wilde, suggest that semiotics of translation, in other words, reading a literary text through semiological analysis before starting a translation act, will greatly help the translator during and after the act of translation.

In conclusion, in a number of studies conducted on literary translation, semiotics of translation was suggested as a guide to readers and translators. As already suggested by Öztürk Kasar (2009a), semiotics of translation will help in discourse level in grasping the meaning universe of the literary text; in inter discourse level, in comparing the source text with the translated text; in meta discourse level, in conducting studies in translation studies. Therefore, further studies could be conducted on the importance of semiotics of translation in literary translation to provide a guide for translators and translator scholars.

REFERENCES

- Aktulum, K. (2011) "Metinlerarasılık // Göstergelerarasılık", Ankara: Kanguru Yayınları.
- Apperson, G. and Manser, M. (2007) "Dictionary of Proverbs", London: Wordsworth Editions.
- Bölükbaşı, O. (2018) "Galen's Neurology",
http://www.academia.edu/27975999/Galenin_N%C3%B6rolojisi_Galens_Neurology, (24.01. 2018.).
- Bulfinch, T. (2017) "Bulfinch's Mythology: The Complete Texts", Toronto: Aegitas.
- French, R. (2002) "Harvey, Clinical Medicine and the College of Physicians", *Clinical Medicine*, 2(6): 584-590.



- Gorlée, D. (1994) “Semiotics and the Problem of Translation: With Special Reference to the Semiotics of Charles S. Peirce”, Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Gorlée, D. (2012) “Wittgenstein in Translation: Exploring Semiotic Signatures”, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Grant, M. (2011) “Myths of the Greeks and Romans”, London: Hachette UK.
- Graves, R (2017) “The Greek Myths: The Complete and Definitive Edition”, London: Penguin UK.
- Hale, D. (1968) “Intestine Sedition: The Fable of the Belly”, *Comparative Literature Studies*, 5(4): 377-388.
- Hamilton, E. (2017) “Mythology: Timeless Tales of Gods and Heroes”, New York: Hachette Book Group.
- Hansen, W. and HANSEN, W. F. (2005) “Classical Mythology: A Guide to the Mythical World of the Greeks and Romans”, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kraeling, E. (1947) “Xisouthros, Deucalion and the Flood Traditions”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 67(3): 177-183.
- Kuleli, M. and Ural, G. (2015) “Gösterge Çözüm Yöntemi ile William Shakespeare’in Merchant of Venice Eserinde Mitolojik ve İkonografik Göndergelerin Saptanması ve Türkçe Çevirilerinin Değerlendirilmesi”, *Uluslararası Dil ve Edebiyat Eğitimi Dergisi*, 13(1): 1-24.
- Leeming, D. (2005) “The Oxford Companion to World Mythology”, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ludskanov, A. (1975) “A Semiotic Approach to the Theory of Translation”, *Language Sciences*, 35: 5-8.
- Murnaghan, S. (2009) “Penelope’s Agnoia: Knowledge, Power and Gender in the Odyssey”, *Homer’s Odyssey*, (ed). Doherty, L, New York: Oxford University Press: 231-246.
- Nagy, G. (1992) “Greek Mythology and Poetics”, London: Vornell University Press.
- Nowotna, M. (2005) “Le Sujet Dans Tous Ses Etas”, *D’une Langue à L’autre*, (ed.) Nowotna, M, Paris: Aux Lieux D’etre: 23-46.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2001) “La Sémiotique Subjectale et la Traduction”, *Third International Congress-Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies Abstracts*, European Society for Translation Copenhagen Business School-Copenhagen.



- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009a) “Pour Une Sémiotique de la Traduction”, La Traduction et Ses Métiers, (ed.) Laplace, C., Lederer, M. and Gile, D., Caen: Lettres Modernes Minard: 163-175.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2009b) “Un Chef-d’oeuvre Très Connu: Le Chef-d’oeuvre Inconnu de Balzac. Commentaries D’une Traduction a L’autre Laissant des Traces”, Les Traces du Traducteur, (ed.) Nowotna, M. and Moghani, A., Paris: Publications de l’INALCO: 187-211.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2012) “Jean-Claude Coquet ile bir Dil Görüngübilimine Doğru”, XII. Uluslararası Dil, Yazın ve Deyişbilim Sempozyumu Bildiriler Kitabı, Trakya University, Edirne: 427-433.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2016a) “Sémiotique de la Traduction Littéraire”, Les Langues Modernes, Dossier: Approches Théoriques de la Traduction, 1: 43-51.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. (2016b) “Interaction Entre la Sémiotique et la Traduction Littéraire”, Translation as Innovation: Bridging the Sciences and the Humanities, 1: 243-260.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. and Tuna, D. (2015) “Yaşam, Yazın ve Yazın Çevirisi İçin Gösterge Okuma”, Frankofoni Fransız Dili ve Edebiyatı İnceleme ve Arařtırması Ortak Kitabı, 27: 457-482.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. and Tuna, D. (2017a) “Shakespeare in Three Languages: Reading and Analyzing Sonnet 130 and its Translations in the Light of Semiotics”, IJLET International Journal of Languages’ Education and Teaching, 5(1): 170-181.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. and Tuna, D. (2017b) “Le Non-dit Derriere les Discours Masques”, IJLET International Journal of Languages’ Education and Teaching, 5(3): 754-767.
- Öztürk Kasar, S. and Batu, E. (2017) “Oscar Wilde’nin Bencil Dev Öyküsünün Göstergebilimsel Çözümlemesi ve Çeviri Göstergebilimi Bağlamında Türkçe Çevirilerinin Değerlendirilmesi”, IJLET International Journal of Languages’ Education and Teaching, 5(4): 920-950.
- Penning, M. (2002) “Hydra Revisited: Substituting Formal for Self- and Informal In-home Care Among Older Adults with Disabilities”, Gerontologist, 42(1): 4-16.
- Riffaterre, M. (1978) “Semiotics of Poetry”, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Riffaterre, M. (1990) “Fictional Truth”, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ring, S. (2003) “Pluto”, Calgary: Weigl Publishers.
- Roman, L. and Roman, M. (2010) “Encyclopedia of Greek and Roman Mythology”, New York: Infobase Publishing.
- Saussure, F. (2001) “Genel Dilbilim Dersleri”, (trans.) Vardar, B, İstanbul: Multilingual Yabancı Dil Yayınları.



Sevgen, C. (2017) “Giriř”, Shakespeare, W. Macbeth, (trans.) Eyübođlu, S., İstanbul: Türkiye İř Bankası Kültür Yayınları: V-XLVI.

Shakespeare, W. (1945) “Coriolanus”, (trans.) Adivar, H.E. and Turhan, V., İstanbul: Pulhan Matbaası.

Shakespeare, W. (1994) “Coriolanus”, (trans.) Bozkurt, B., İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Shakespeare, W. (1998) “Coriolanus”, New York: Oxford University Press.

Stecconi, U. (2007) “Five Reasons Why Semiotics is Good for Translation Studies”, Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies, (ed.) Gambier, Y., Shlesinger, M. and Stolze, R., Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 15-26.

Stewart, W. (1998) “Dictionary of Images and Symbols in Counselling”, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Tanha, S. (2014) “Pluto, Lord of the Underworld, an Analysis”, SPICA, 2(1): 44-51.

Thompson, D. (2004) “The Trojan War Literature and Legends From the Bronze Age to the Present”, London: McFarland.

Torop, P. (2000) “Towards the Semiotics of Translation”, Semiotica, 128(3-4): 597-610.

Tuna, D. (2016) “Çevirmek İin Çözümlemek: Bel Kaufman’ın Sunday in the Park Başlıklı Öyküsünde Anlam Arayışı”, RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Arařtırmaları Dergisi, 5: 76-97.

Tuna, D. and Kuleli, M. (2017) “Çeviri Göstergebilimi Çerevesinde Yazınsal Çeviri İin bir Metin Çözümleme ve Karşılařtırma Modeli”, Konya: Eğitim Yayınevi.